



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,410	06/19/2001	Mustansir Faizullahbho	00AN061	3164

7590 10/04/2002
John M. Miller, Esq.
Rockwell International
Firstar Center
777 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202

EXAMINER

JONES, JUDSON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,410

Applicant(s)

FAIZULLABHOY ET AL. *fl*

Examiner

Judson H. Jones

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5. 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. in view of McCormick and Pieronek et al. Takahashi et al. discloses a path module for a linear motor comprising at least one armature winding, a module controller and a path module as described in column 3 lines 20-41 but does not disclose an amplifier connected to the armature winding or a different address for each module. However McCormick teaches connecting an amplifier to a winding in column 2 lines 63-66 for the purpose of raising a command signal to a high enough level so that it can excite a coil. Since McCormick and Takahashi et al. are both from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized an amplifier in the

Art Unit: 2834

device of Takahashi et al. in order to raise the command signal to a high enough level that it could excite a coil. In regard to the separate addresses for each module, Pieronek et al. teaches this feature in column 2 lines 55-61 for a highly distributed industrial control system that achieves “extremely fast processing times because the actual program may be simultaneously executed on the various control modules” also “improves the ability to troubleshoot any failure.” See Pieronek et al. column 31-44. In column 11 lines 62-65 Takahashi et al. describes his system as a “distributed control system.” Since Pieronek et al. and Takahashi et al. as modified by McCormick are both from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized a separate address for each module in order to increase the speed of the system and to improve troubleshooting. See Takahashi et al. column 5 lines 6-13 for examples of breakdowns of his device.

In regard to claim 9, see Takahashi et al. column 4 lines 28-30.

In regard to claim 10, see Takahashi et al. figure 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13-33 are allowed.

Claims 6-8 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: In regard to claims 6 and 13, the prior art of record does not disclose or teach a stage combined with a distributed control system having different addresses for each module such as the distributed control system disclosed by Takahashi et al. as modified by Pieronek et al. In regard to claims 12

Art Unit: 2834

and 26-28, Takahashi et al. discloses modules that control four windings each and Pieronek et al. teaches giving modules individual addresses. Conceivably someone might utilize a separate module for each winding, thus giving each module and its associated winding a unique address, but this does not seem to be obvious. Without a unique address for each winding, instructions from the motor controller addressing each respective armature winding as recited in claims 12 and 26-28 are not possible.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Judson H Jones whose telephone number is 703-308-0115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

JHJ

September 29, 2002

Judson H Jones
Art Unit 2834